

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Plumularia* Lamarck, 1816 (Cnidaria, Hydrozoa) by the designation of *Sertularia setacea* Linnaeus, 1758 as the type species

(Case 2978; see BZN 53: 167–170)

L.B. Holthuis

*Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden,
The Netherlands*

In the application (para. 5) it is noted that the valid type designation for *Plumularia* Lamarck, 1816 is by Busk (1851). There is, however, an earlier designation by H. Milne Edwards in the Disciples edition of Cuvier's *Règne Animal*, vol. 20 (1836–1849), pl. 67, fig. 5, where *Plumularia pluma* (Linnaeus, 1758) is the only figured species of that genus. As the title page of the work says 'édition accompagnée de planches gravées représentant les types de tous les genres' this is a valid type designation. Here, the name *Plumularia cristata* Lamarck, 1816 is cited in the synonymy of *P. pluma*, while Lamarck (1816) cited *Sertularia pluma* in his synonymy of *P. cristata*.

H. Milne Edwards's type designation is older than that of Busk (1851) and invalidates the latter. This does not change anything in the proposal made in the application, as the words 'to set aside all previous designations of type species' (para. 12(1)) includes the designations of both H. Milne Edwards (1836–1849) and Busk (1851).

The dates of publication of the plates in Milne Edwards's volume are still very wide (see Cowan, 1976, *Journal of the Society for the Bibliography of Natural History*, 8(1): 63–64) but all antedate 1851.

Comments on the proposed suppression for nomenclatural purposes of S.D. Kaicher's *Card Catalogue of World-Wide Shells* (1973–1992)

(Case 2964; see BZN 53: 96–98, 273–277)

(1) Emily H. Vokes

*Geology Department, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118–5698,
U.S.A.*

I have read with great dismay the request by Kabat for suppression of Kaicher's *Card Catalogue of World-Wide Shells*. This is the most frivolous bit of trivia to engage the attention of the Commission in my memory. Kaicher's work was never intended to be for nomenclatural purposes, any more than the dozens of shell picture books that have come onto the market in recent years. If you start having to act on every book that illustrates a supposed holotype or lectotype from some museum collection, you will be very busy indeed. You might start with Abbott & Dance's *Compendium of Seashells* (1982), which illustrates beautifully dozens of holotype or lectotype specimens.

The act of figuring a shell and mentioning it as a lectotype is not, to me, a valid designation of a lectotype. Unless she had stated that 'I here designate specimen no. XXXX as lectotype', she is merely quoting something on a label in a collection.